

8

---

---

SPEECH

OF

J. W. QUIGGLE, Esq., of Philadelphia,

JUNE 9th, 1868.

ON

THE RADICAL PLATFORM.

---

---

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

Meeting of the Democracy of the Eighth Ward, in the City of Philadelphia.

The Democratic Association of the Eighth Ward met at their hall on Tuesday evening, June 9th, 1868. Col. William D. Lewis, Jr., presiding. After the ordinary business of the meeting had been acted upon, it was announced that Ex-State Senator J. W. Quiggle, had been invited to address the meeting, to which he responded. His speech was listened to with the utmost attention, and a unanimous request was made by motion, that Mr Quiggle furnish his remarks for publication.

## SPEECH

OF.

J. W. QUIGGLE, Esq., of Philadelphia,

JUNE 9th, 1868.

ON,

## THE RADICAL PLATFORM.

---

Mr. QUIGGLE said: It is my intention to suggest a few thoughts for the consideration of this meeting, upon the platform of the Republican party, as promulgated by them in their recent convention at Chicago.

Upon this platform and their antecedents for the last eight years they go before the country. These furnish a fruitful theme, for us all to dwell upon. I shall, therefore, take up the first two of the propositions in the order in which they occur.

"*First.* We congratulate the country on the assured success of the reconstruction projects of Congress, as evinced by the adoption, in a majority of the States lately in rebellion, of Constitutions securing equal, civil, and political rights to all, and regard it as the duty of the government to sustain these constitutions, and to prevent the people of such States from being remitted to a state of anarchy."

This is a congratulation to the people—the whole people of this Union—on what they call the success of the reconstruction projects of Congress, “in securing equal, civil, and political rights to ALL.”

Let us see, for a moment, upon what this congratulation is based; for if it has no foundation in truth or the facts of the case, then it is a fraud and deception upon the people, and should be denounced and rejected.

Is it based, I ask, upon the awful fact and wrong of fanaticism and passion, that we have been involved in a civil war which has no equal in modern times—which has appalled the world with its atrocities—which has murdered our citizens, disturbed the peace and harmony of the nation, broken up the ties of brotherly love and fellowship, made our homes homeless and cheerless, made desolate a fair portion of our land, disturbed trade and commerce—and plunged ourselves and generations to come in a DEBT, it is futile to say may ever be paid?

Is it a subject for congratulation, that our American citizens—white men and white women and children, and citizens of foreign birth, now living and to come after us, shall have the enormous interest on this increasing debt to pay annually—and finally, if possible, to pay the principal; and thus subject us all to a state of want, abject poverty, total ruin and destruction? And whilst, at the same time, all this is done that the negro, an inferior, unequal and dissimilar race, shall be enobled and placed, I say, far above a large portion of our people in social and political relations?

Is it *true*, that equal, civil political rights are secured to *all*, while Freedmen's Bureaus are established in many States, with their hordes of insulting officers to white people—to elevate, protect, feed, and clothe at the expense of the government, lazy, lounging, stealing, wandering negroes; and to impoverish, humiliate and degrade our brothers and sisters of the white race?

Is it *true* that equal, civil, and political rights are given to all, when Military divisions are established with military commanders, among a people who are not in arms but powerless and already humiliated in the dust—to further subdue, prostrate, and harass them, and hold them as submissive and menial slaves to their arbitrary and despotic power? God save us from such a congratulation on equal, civil, and political rights!

Yes, it is a beautiful theme, too, for congratulation, that a most foul, wicked and groundless attempt has been made to depose the Chief Magistrate of a great nation, to our utter disgrace, solely for the purpose of self-partizan aggrandizement, and in order that this party may continue in power to subvert the purest principles of a just government; that this Congress may inflict further iniquity and woe upon the people, and that the officeholders among them may continue to dwell in their luxurious wealth! Yes, it is a subject for high exultation, that military commissions and inquisitions, star-chamber trials and secret conveniences, have been established in the land, whereby the life, personal liberty and character of the citizen may be at their mercy, and his property and private papers be seized and taken possession of, in violation of all law, right or authority! Instead of a congratulatory address to the country, these men should have confessed before God, and implored his pardon for themselves, and mercy upon the people whom they have so deeply injured and depressed!

But, I do not stop here on this section of this most untruthful platform. Is it again an item of comfort, that this party have assumed and propose to assume powers in legislation which no party ever assumed or pretended to assume since the government began? Whereby our glorious constitution under which we have lived so happily and so long, has been cloven down, trampled in the dust and defiled? That constitution by which *all* our civil, religious, and political liberties and equal rights were to be protected and defended!

Is it *true*, I ask, that these measures have secured “equal, and civil,

political rights to all?" Equal rights! What equal rights? Is it an equal right that all the negroes of sufficient age shall have the right of suffrage and of holding office, while hundreds of thousands of white men are excluded from this privilege and this right? Is it right or fair that Constitutions should be imposed upon whole States, by an unauthorized Congress, by this mode of unequal suffrage, and without, therefore, the consent of the governed?

These States were never out of the Union. No evil act of theirs could have taken them out, under the Constitution. Secession could not have done it, nor can secession ever do it. THE UNION WAS TO BE PERPETUAL. Nothing, therefore, but a successful revolution and rebellion, which has not been the case, could have done it, or could do it. But this question I shall discuss when considering another section of this immaculate platform. If they were not out of the Union by this latter means—and the result of the war proves it—then they are what they were before—States *in* the Union with their *respective Constitutions*. These Constitutions could only be changed or amended according to the several modes or provisions contained therein, and not in any other way—and then not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States. It is not pretended that Congress could or can change the Constitution of any other State admitted into the Union. Why, therefore, these States, if they *are in* the Union? The legislation for territories and the admission of new States is an entirely different subject, and has no bearing whatever upon this question.

All this congratulatory proclamation to the people has neither truth, solidity or honesty in it. It is a blushing shame—a farce before the intelligent judgment of the people of this nation, before the common sense of the world and before God! This disposes of my present thoughts upon the first section of the platform; and its further consideration I leave for yourselves.

We approach the second, which reads as follows:

"*Second.* The guarantee of Congress of equal suffrage to all loyal men at the South, was demanded by every consideration of public safety, of gratitude and of justice, and must be maintained, while the question of suffrage in all the loyal States properly belongs to the people of these States."

This section is easily comprehended. It simply asserts the right of Congress to regulate the suffrage of the people in the States of this Union, except in the Northern States—gently denominated "loyal States," or the States in rebellion. Let us see about this. Here is a distinction which will confuse them very much to maintain. They must fight it out, however, on some line. What line? None other than the line of *demagogism*—that is the only line.

The party forming this platform must afford the people some *legal, tangible ground for this distinction*. Do they pretend that there is any thing in the Constitution which gives them any authority to make this distinction? No. Do they say, that in all the legislation and history of the past, that they can find any precedent for it? No. They admit they have no right to interfere with this subject in the Northern States. But in the Southern they have exercised and still persist in exercising it. They can have but one plea. That plea is, that these latter States, in consequence of their rebellion, are not States—are out of the Union—and are simply territories over which Congress has exclusive jurisdiction. And upon this I take decided issue with them. Let us see where Congress and the Government stood upon this question, shortly after the war broke out. I am going to read here—an interesting incident from a document containing the proceedings of the Congress of the United States, 1861—an incident of those times which is worthy the highest consideration of every pure, honest and patriotic citizen—one which I commend to the thoughtful care and earnest perusal of



the framers of this platform—to the late Congress whom they so highly applaud and adore, to every man who was *for* the war and who was *against* it, to the noble, good citizen wherever dispersed throughout the land, North, South, East and West; whether he be the son of New England, the inhabitant of the Middle States, the sturdy pioneer of the prairies and forests towards the setting of the sun, the dweller among the palmettos, or the foreigner on our shores! I am about to read a resolution which will stand as an eternal monument to the greatness of our name, and reflect everlasting glory upon the American character!

But, when we come to think of it, and see how wantonly, how wickedly, how sacrilegiously we have behaved and acted since the tumult of battle has been over and peace restored, our cheeks will tinge with a deep blush of shame, and our perfidy and infidelity to this pledge will be the blackest spot on our national escutcheon. And nothing but sincere repentance and reform of our ways, and doing *justice to the conquered and subdued*, will ever wipe this stain from the page of American history!

The resolution referred to was offered by Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, now the Chief Magistrate of the Union, in the Senate of the United States, July 26th, 1861.

“On the 26th July, 1861, Senator Johnson offered the following resolution :  
*“Resolved, That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States, now in revolt against the Constitutional Government, and in arms around the Capital; that, in this national emergency, Congress, banishing all feeling of mere passion and resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not prosecuted, upon our part, in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, nor for the purpose of interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and all laws made in pursuance thereof, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired; that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease.”*

The same, or a similar resolution was offered in the House of Representatives, by J. J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, on the 22d of the same month, and was adopted by EIGHTY YEAS TO FIVE NOES!

Fellow citizens, have we come up to this pledge in any one of its particulars? No, not one.

Upon the faith of this principle laid down by Congress as the platform and object of the war, the *Democratic party* contributed their aid in its prosecution. With this understanding all parties looked upon its progress, and in this view, the world contemplated it. But how sadly we have all been deceived and disappointed.

I ask these questions, and submit their answer to the judgment of mankind:

Have we vanished all feeling of mere passion or resentment? No.

Have we recollected only our duty to the whole government? No.

Has this war been prosecuted upon our part in a spirit of oppression? Yes.

Has it been for any purpose of conquest or subjugation? Yes, yes.

Has it not been for interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States?

And has it been only to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and all laws made in pursuance of the same, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired? No, no. No, not in any one particular. Not one pledge has been lived up to; not one promise fulfilled!

But war of the direst cast and of the bloodiest die has followed in every

train. The most absolute subjugation has been perpetrated. And carnage, spoils and devastation have everywhere abounded. Cities and towns have been ransacked, pillaged and burnt without justification. The people everywhere oppressed and degraded; their dearest rights to home, to government, to free-born citizens taken from them; and *whole States* made vassals to Congress—slaves to the armies now over them—and without the protections of civil law, or the guardianship of the American government!

This is and has been the condition of affairs, and they afford mournful contemplations in our silent thoughts over the past and present!

How then, could President Johnson have acted otherwise than he did, under this pledge of which he was the chief author, and under the obligations of his oath? If he had, he would have been false to his professions—false to truth—false to his religion—false to his manhood. No epithet could have been sufficiently expressed to brand his name with infamy. But thanks to his name, he has stood in colossal grandeur amidst the tumult and passion of the hour. And when the wild storms of public animosity shall have receded—when the temper of the times shall have vanished away—when grave statesmen and the world shall applaud his acts, he will stand the colossus of the age!

But, leaving out and not regarding all these violations of faith so solemnly and publicly declared, I assume another position for my objections to the legislation of the present so-called Congress, on the subject of suffrage *in any of the States*.

I maintain that this Congress, is not and has not been a *constitutional Congress* of the *United States*. If I show, therefore, that it has not been, then all their acts on the subject are null and void for want of jurisdiction. And to this view of the case, fellow citizens, I seriously solicit your attention.

Article 1, Section 1, of the Constitution, provides thus:

"All legislative powers herein granted, shall be vested in a Congress, of the UNITED STATES, which shall consist of a SENATE and House of Representatives.

Same Article, Section 3, 1. "The SENATE of the United States *shall* be composed of two SENATORS from EACH STATE, chosen by the Legislatures thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

Same Article, Section 2, 1. "The HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the SEVERAL STATES."

Same Article, Section 2, 3. "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the SEVERAL STATES, which may be INCLUDED WITHIN THIS UNION according to their respective numbers," &c.

What, then, *is* a Senate, as provided for in the above articles of the Constitution? Is the present organization at Washington, calling itself a Senate, legally so? Is it composed of two Senators from each State? By no means. Are there not TEN STATES UNREPRESENTED? Did not these States duly elect Senators to represent them? It is not denied but that they did. But have they not been rejected and excluded? Who excluded them? And by what right, for what reason, and for what purpose?

And in regard to the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; of what and of whom is this to be composed? *By members chosen by the people of the SEVERAL STATES*.

What is meant by the *several States*? all, or only a part thereof? I contend *all* the States which have elected members. In the very section above named, when the Constitution of 1787 was adopted, among others, the following States were specifically enumerated, with the number of Representatives belonging to each respectively, viz: *Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three*. Are these States now represented, and are those afterwards admitted into the Federal Union known as

Southern States, represented in the present "House of Representatives?" Not at all. Why? Because that they did not elect members? Not so. They did elect; and these members in due form presented their credentials and claimed their rights. Who said no? Why the mere scratch of the pen of a menial clerk. Who does not know this? And is there any law for such a procedure? Who, that has any honesty in his soul, can face the general judgment of intelligent men on this subject! Not a man. Is it possible that this is to be a precedent for the future by which we are to be guided? if so, where is the safety of the Government or the rights of the people? They are lost forever!

If, then, by this unauthorized act, certain States were excluded from representation in the present "House" it is *no House of Representatives*, under the Constitution, and their JURISDICTION does not exist.

I admit that, during the rebellion, and whilst the war lasted, the then Congress had full, complete, and undisputed authority over the subject of the war and over the States, which were in defiance of its authority; but after this ceased, after their armies laid down their arms to Grant, to Sherman and the Government, and suspended hostilities, then the war was at an end, the objects of the Government were accomplished, and the States restored to the Union. "Not a stripe erased, not a star obscured, but the flag every where spread all over in characters of living light, blazing in all its ample folds as they float over the sea, and over the land, and in every wind over the whole heavens!"

If any body has been guilty of *treason*, there is a penalty attaching to this, prescribed by law, and *no other can be inflicted*. It is a well-settled principle of law, that where a crime is defined by statute, and a penalty attached to its commission, this penalty only can be inflicted. But in the present instance, "Congress" (?) takes it upon themselves, not to bring offenders to trial in the courts, *but to exclude whole States from the Union*, and then to regulate their domestic affairs without representation.

My points then in this connection are:

*First.* That Congress has no right—if it were even a legal Congress—to interfere with the rights of the States on the question of suffrage.

*Second.* That they have no right to make any distinction between the States on the subject.

*Third.* Or to amend the Constitutions of any States, or to impose new ones upon them.

*Fourth.* They have no right to exclude any State from representation, except for informality of election, or existing disqualification of its members by the Constitution of the United States. And,

*Fifth.* This Congress, to say the least of it, has a *doubtful legal and legitimate being*.

This, fellow-citizens, concludes my observations on the *legal* view of the affair.

But there is another view—an honest view, a fair view—from which we must look at this subject. It is in the MORAL, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL VIEW. The education of our people from the inception of our government has regarded the negro or the black race as inferior to the white race in all these views. And such seems universally to be the judgment of all the other races in the world. Whether this be from selfishness or prejudice, I do not propose to discuss. But it is simply the fact. The black-skinned, noxious negro is not morally, socially or politically equal to the white man *any where on the globe*.

It is true, God has made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth. But this does not assert that he has created them



*equal*, more than he has created men equal in *stature of body or capacity of mind!*

The question then arises, can we make these people equal with us in the above relations, in the face of our prejudices, in the face of our social feeling, the dissimilarity of race, the disgust of ourselves, and the hatred of our children? We cannot do so. We cannot in an hour, day, month, year or an age do so. And no power should compel the people to submit to, or recognize it at the present time.

But what is this legislation doing? What is to be attained by bestowing the right to vote and to hold office, upon the negro? Why, the moment we give these political rights to him, that moment we relinquish the policy of our judgment, the force of our education, and the sense of our common brotherhood upon this subject. The consequence of this state of affairs is not so much to be deprecated in the North, where the negroes are few, but in the Southern States, where they comprise so large a part of the population, and where in some places they are in the preponderancy.

If you ask a negro for his vote, you admit his equality with yourself in this political right, and you cannot deny him equality in other respects. He is entitled to office; has a right to demand your vote in return and the fellowship of yourself and family. If he is an alderman, you must respect and give him due deference in his authority; if he be a judge, you must be obedient to his decisions and obsequious to the dignity of his honorable position. If he be a Senator or member of the House of Representatives in Congress, he is above you in authority, and you must be obedient to his laws. In these points, therefore, of position, he is not only your equal, but your superior!

Then, how are you to reconcile any other state of society, than that of social equal relations in all these departments?

It begins in canvassing for elections—going together to the polls—levelling the intelligent vote of the white man with the ignorant vote of the negro. It continues, in recognizing him equal in every political privilege and right thereafter—as a magistrate or legislator—in all the departments of government, without imposing upon him any qualification or capacity for these positions. When you meet him in the halls of Congress, you must respect, *honor and cajole him*. When his lady, as you must then call her—and her accomplished daughters, accompanying the honorable member of Congress to Washington, he, she and they, must of course, be recognized and received in the polite circles of that society. Politicians will court his influence and favor there, and at home the case will be similar. And here it will be perceived is the strong helping hand to family and domestic equality of association.

If this be denied or rejected, it is an insult; and strife, commotions and dissensions, are instantly in our midst, and the peace and harmony of society disturbed. It does not stop here. The undoubted result will be the *AMALGAMATION OF THE RACES*, which would make it still worse. The fair hands of our daughters will be clasped in the fist of the black man—her white arm be locked in that of the negro—and she, the white girl, become his wife, his companion and the mother of his children! And then what a race! What a discordant race—what an unequal and *unnatural race* are linked together! and what a race will we become!

This amalgamation does not strengthen in the least degree, the bodily organism of the white race, or enlarge or embellish his mental capacity. But on the contrary, deforms the man physically, and dements and subtracts from him his original intellectuality. The experience of the world has fully demonstrated this fact. He has lost his identity and his originality, and he is on the downward road to degradation and barbarity. In fact, wherever this mixture of the black with the other races of creation has occurred, this has been the result. Then, I say, give to the negro this right of equal

suffrage—the right to hold office—and this equal relation in society, and farewell, farewell to the Anglo-Saxon Caucasian race of America! It cannot be tolerated—it must not be permitted—though the heavens fall!

But, thanks to the signs of the times, there is a storm coming, and is now sweeping over the land, that will hurl the advocates of such a policy into the darkest abysses of time! It has started in OREGON, where the broad billows of the Pacific roll his mighty waves against her borders, and will continue to grow wilder and wilder until it reaches the surges of the Atlantic and spreads itself with wilder fury as it rushes through the Cypress trees of the dying South!

Yes, there is a star, too, rising in yonder eastern horizon, where most of these troubles commenced, that is rolling onward and upward in the sky of our future—growing brighter and brighter every day, until it will soon trail its long stream of glory and gladness on the land.



